DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 593 JC 790 340

AUTHOR Lord, Judith A.
TITLE A Survey of the Student Opinion at Everett Community College Regarding the Student's Role in College Governance.
PUB DATE 25 Jan 78
NOTE 104p.; Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; *Community Colleges; *Governance; Liberal Arts; Part Time Students; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Student Government; Student Participation; *Student Role; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

A two-part, in-class questionnaire was administered to 150 randomly selected Everett Community College (Washington) students in an effort to determine their attitudes toward college governance. Part I of the questionnaire asked students to indicate their desire for involvement in each of 30 college activities. Part II solicited information on the student's current level of involvement and on his/her perception of the usefulness of student participation in college governance. Survey participants were drawn in equal numbers from the following groups: academic, vocational, and part-time students. Summary results indicate that while students strongly desired to be involved, they had little knowledge of their student body or its relationship to college governance, and were unwilling to participate in the committees currently available. The students did not ask for total control in any area, but wanted at least an equal voice with faculty and administration in two-thirds of the areas surveyed, including setting institutional goals, selecting the college president, and curriculum or course revision. The areas in which students did not desire participation were all faculty-oriented activities, such as determining teaching loads and class size. The survey report includes an analysis of the responses to each questionnaire item, a review of the literature on college governance, and the questionnaire. (Author/JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184593

A SURVEY OF THE STUDENT OPINION AT EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGARDING THE STUDENT'S ROLE IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

by

Judith A. Lord

Everett Community College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith A. Lord

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 340

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

January 25, 1978

A Survey of the Student Opinion at Everett Community College Regarding the Student's Role In College Governance

by

Judith A. Lord

ABSTRACT

In order to determine the attitude of students at Everett Community College regarding their role in college governance, 150 students were asked to respond to a questionnaire designed to survey their desire for involvement in governance at their college. The questionnaire was submitted in a randomly selected classroom setting to 50 students in each of the student categories: vocational, academic, and part-time. The results of the survey revealed that students strongly desired to be involved, but had little knowledge of their student body or its relationship to college governance, and were largely unwilling to participate in committees presently available. Students did not ask for total control in any area, but wanted at least an equal voice with faculty and administration in two-thirds of the areas surveyed, namely: setting institutional goals, establishing attendance policies, student publications, selecting of college president, selection of college officials directly related to student affairs, allocation of student activity fees, regulation of student conduct, regulation of student organizations, approval of guest speakers invited by students, alterations in college calendar, distribution of student-initiated and off-campus literature on campus, release of student records, curricula or course revision, student probation and suspension policies, development of campus physical facilities, planning commencement exercises, and faculty evaluation. Recommendations include: formation of a campus-wide committee to discuss avenues of change; circulation of a questionnaire to survey projects of interest to students; evaluation of committees for student perception of effectiveness; and streamlining the process of student government, for effective utilization of time and effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
ABSTRACT		2
LIST OF TABLES		4
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	6
2	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	9
	Characteristics of the Community College Student	10
	Systems of College Governance	13
	Why the Student Should Be Involved in Community College Governance	14
	Effectiveness of the Student in Community College Governance	16
3	PROCEDURES	19
4	RESULTS	22
5	DISCUSSION AND CRITERIA	83
6	RECOMMENDATIONS	86
REFERENCE		88
APPENDICES		
A	Letter from the Dean of Students to Nova University	90
B	Letter from Author to Students	92
C	Questionnaire on Student Involvement in College Governance	94
D	Letter from Dean of Students to Faculty	99
E	Letter Showing Preliminary Tally of Results	101

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Setting Institutional Goals	22
2.	Establishing Attendance Policies	24
3.	Student Publications	26
4.	Selection of College President	27
5.	Selection of College Officials Directly Related to Student Affairs	29
6.	Allocation of Student Activity Fees	31
7.	Faculty Hiring	33
8.	Faculty Promotion	34
9.	Allocation of Annual College Budget	36
10.	Regulation of Student Conduct	38
11.	Recognition of Student Organization	40
12.	Approval of Guest Speakers Invited by Students	42
13.	Teaching Loads	44
14.	Class Size	45
15.	Alterations in College Calendar	47
16.	Distribution of Student-Initiated Literature on Campus	49
17.	Distribution of Off-Campus Literature on Campus	51
18.	Teacher Salaries	52
19.	Requirements for Degrees and Certificates	54

TABLE		PAGE
20.	Release of Student Records	56
21.	Admission Standards for Curricula and Courses	58
22.	Curricula of Course Revision, Addition, Deletion	60
23.	Allocation of Student Financial Aid	62
24.	Student Probation and Suspension Policies	63
25.	Development of Campus Physical Facilities	65
26.	Determining Administrative Structure of the College	67
27.	Planning Commencement Exercises	69
28.	College Publications	71
29.	Establishing Grading Policies	72
30.	Faculty Evaluations	74
31.	I Feel That More Student Participation College Government Would Make No Difference in How the College Is Run	76
32.	I am Currently Participating in Our College Government	77
33.	I Have Very Little Knowledge About College Government	78
34.	I Have Very Little Knowledge About Student Body Activities at Our College	79
35.	I Am Fully Aware of the Funding Available for Student Body Activities	80
36.	I Would Like to Have a Voice in the Allocation of Student Body Funds	81
37.	I Would Enjoy Being on a Committee to Investigate Whether Current Student Body Activities Meet Student Needs	82

INTRODUCTION

Everett Community College, together with Edmonds Community College forms the multi-campus District V, meeting the post-secondary educational needs of residents in Snohomish County in the State of Washington. This survey will concern itself only with Everett.

The purpose of this study is to survey how the students at Everett Community College perceive their role in college governance. In the recent Associated Students' annual election of officers at Everett Community College, the new Student Body President was elected by a vote cast by less than four percent of the student body. The President of the college expressed difficulty in placing confidence in the representative quality of the vote when so few students record their concern. (Clark, 1977) Therefore, this study is needed in order to examine how the students view their involvement in the governance of the college.

Richardson and Bender (1974,1) regard governance as "an umbrella term used to encompass the web of communication and decision making which transforms a collectivity of individuals into an organization engaged in purposeful activity." Munroe (1972,184) sees it as a collective term encompassing all aspects relating to the "control and direction of the college." Within the parameters of these broad definitions

flourishes a variety of governance structures, each prescribing roles for branches of the college community according to the perception of power held by its members.

Student involvement in governance is seen by many administrators as a desirable goal, not only for the widely recognized view that it affords the students experience that will "enhance their effectiveness as citizens" but that it also serves to reduce disorder due to student activists. (MacGregor, 1973,15) From the student's point of view, it is unlikely that the typical community college student will see himself participating in governance unless he sees his role as being effective.

There have been many studies relating to student involvement in governance. Some have been concerned with the full-time day student. (Bass, 1975) Others have narrowed the scope further to include only those students enrolled in non-vocational courses. (Jones, 1974) Restrictions such as these serve to survey only those students who closely resemble the typical four-year college student. The characteristics of the typical community college student are sufficiently different from those of the four-year student, that in order to assess student attitudes it is necessary to look at all categories of student on the community college campus. The community college student today, is more likely to be part-time than full-time, has an average age of twenty-eight, and will be involved in a vocational direction rather than working toward a baccalaureate degree. The community college

student has not, at any stage, the desire for involvement seen in his University counterpart. A decade ago when student dissent was at its height in the major universities and students were asking for more involvement in their education, such activism was found to be almost totally absent in the two-year colleges. (Keniston, 1971)

The results of the last student election at Everett Community College reveal a lack of interest in college governance consistent with findings in the literature, therefore the question of the student's role in this area is currently regarded as a priority need for investigation. The Director of Student Affairs has, for the past year, been involved in an extensive study in the general area of student governance, and a student committee is currently working to identify alternative methods of utilizing the present system to be more responsive to student needs.

Research for this study was conducted on the basis of a survey instrument distributed to students in the classroom setting. A table of random numbers was utilized in order to select classes for distribution of the questionnaire. The Dean of Students strongly agreed as to the value of the study in planning for student involvement in campus governance, and personally contacted by letter each instructor whose class setting was chosen in the random selection.

The survey instrument consisted of thirty-seven questions asking the students to indicate their desire for involvement in a variety of college activities. The data

collected was displayed in terms of frequency distribution and percentage.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The attitude of the community college student in the seventies appears to be one of indifference toward his role in college governance. A survey of eighty-five two-year colleges showed less than forty percent of the students voting that year in student body elections, with less than twenty percent of students voting in more than thirty-eight percent of the colleges. (Deegan, 1970)

A study to determine the participation of evening and part-time students in college governance in thirty-two community colleges in Pennsylvania and New Jersey revealed that in only seventeen institutions were part-time students allowed to vote for student government officers. (Chalick, et al., 1974) No institutions reported that students could sit as voting members in institutional committees.

Student involvement in college governance has not increased as we move toward the close of the seventies. This became evident during the recent Associated Students annual election of officers at Everett Community College, when the new Student Body President was elected by a vote of less than four percent of the student body. The President of the College announced his concern in a report to the Board of Trustees, expressing difficulty in placing confidence in the representative quality of the vote when so few students record

their interest. (Clark, 1977)

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973), in examining student participation in college governance, traced the degree of student influence historically from the early days of a fixed curriculum and a "loco parentis" attitude to the present time when they feel that considerable gains have actually been made in numbers and interests of the student in the areas of governance. This influence has had a history of highs and lows, and it appears important to heed the commission's recommendation to examine student governance now while activity is running in "low gear," particularly where they can make a quality contribution and not be included on the basis of disruption prevention.

At this point in time it can be seen that while some studies show student involvement in college governance to be on the decline in the past decade, others show student involvement as being stifled by an enforced limitation of participation. The long term view shows gradual improvement, but there is a current precariousness about the whole question of student involvement in college governance. Therefore, it would not be reasonable to take the community college student to task for his apparent apathy without taking a closer look at four important areas that directly affect his participation.

Characteristics of the Community College Student

In attempting to understand the indifference seen in

the community college student as he relates to the governance of his college, it is necessary to examine the characteristics that separate him from the activists of a decade ago, and from his university counterpart today. Unlike many university students, the community college students tend to come from non-college families, with little opportunity for role identification. (Richardson, 1972) These students are unable to see themselves in a decision-making role and show widespread indifference toward participation in the development of college policies.

There is a need to work. Most community college students come from a middle to lower-middle income family and need to work at least part-time in order to finance their schooling. (Thornton, 1960) This in itself is time-consuming and many students find they have little surplus energy for college concerns other than purely academic.

Community college students seldom have close connections with the campus. Unlike the university student who frequently lives on campus or close by, the community college student often commutes long distances and tends to leave the campus immediately after each day's classes are concluded. He is less interested in on-campus activities and relegates the time he spends on campus to the fewest possible hours. (George and George, 1971)

For many students community involvement takes precedence. The average community college student is considerably older than the university student and has usually formed ties

to home and community. He will already be involved in activities unrelated to the college, and would be reluctant to give these up for a new set of responsibilities. Without evidence of his participation being effective, he is unlikely to become involved. (Deegan, Drexal, Collins and Kearney, 1970)

Many are transfer students. Those students who are in the younger age group frequently have as their goal the four year university. These students are also aware of the temporary quality of their time at the community college, and see little value in student participation in governance of the college.

Evening part-time attendance accounts for a large part of the student body. Very seldom do these students become involved in regular student activities. Even elections in most colleges are day-time affairs, with the evening vote not accounted for. The neglect of this group is compounded by timing most student activities to occur during the day. In their study of part-time students at thirty-two community colleges in the eastern states, Chalick et al, (1974) found that in about one-third of the colleges, evening students were not permitted to vote, and at others only the full-time student received this privilege. It becomes apparent that a great many administrators do not equate student growth and maturity with participation in college governance.

Systems of College Governance

To summarize these systems briefly, there are generally considered to be three that function more or less effectively in the community college. (Baldridge, 1971) First is the bureaucratic, the most traditional model of governance, where a hierarchy of relationships descends from the president or board of trustees at the top through the faculty to the students below. This system has functioned efficiently for decision making, but adapted poorly to the need for change. Second is the collegial or shared authority, a newer model of governance which has two main versions. In the first are separate jurisdictions where administration, faculty and students each attend to those matters most obviously related to their jurisdiction. In the more recent model, authority is shared in all areas. Keeton (1971) has found that this is all too frequently referred to as a "zero-sum-gain" where one member's gain is another's loss. The political or conflict model came into being as the third system of governance, in the late sixties through collective bargaining following student activism, or faculty unionism. Baldridge (1971) sees this model as a dynamic process containing "neither the rigid, formal aspects of bureaucracy nor the calm consensus directed elements of the academic collegium." He does, however, see a weakness in the system at a time when student interest in governance is at a low ebb, for conflict is dependent upon interest, and if this is not present there will be no contenders at the bargaining table.

The student needs to be concerned about the predominant governance system operating in his college, for upon the ability of a particular system to adapt to change, depends the future acceptance of the student, as an effective, growing functional member. In our "Future Shock" world of today, adaptation and the ability to change without total disorganization and disruption of a system are the only way an individual or an institution will remain functional. (Toffler,1970) The bureaucratic system is shown to be very effective in maintaining organizational structure and carrying out established policies, but not in making the changes necessary to formulate new policy to meet the challenge of the times (Bennis, 1969); the collegian model is dismissed as a utopia with no force to bring participants together with enough strength to make voluntary changes; only the political model shows the strength to formulate policy and execute it, using whatever factions of the former two systems that may offer expediency. (Baldridge, 1971)

Why the Student Should be Involved in Community College Governance

Controversy reigns as to the wisdom of having students participate in the governance of their college. In many institutions policy planning has negated the opportunity for student involvement, citing inexperience and lack of knowledge concerning institutional goals as detrimental to their participation. Nevertheless many administrators view student involvement in college governance as a desirable goal

affording the students an experience that will enhance their effectiveness as citizens. (MacGregor, 1973)

The total education of a student, whether his field be vocational, academic, or the part-time updating of skills in either field depends on his ability to see himself as a self directed, effective individual, capable of making his own decisions in home and community. Proficiency and awareness of these attributes can only be acquired through involvement. Collins (1975) expressed four philosophical thoughts that united the college, education and the student, calling for completeness in all areas.

> 1. Education for development as a total person deserves higher priority than training as a worker.
>
> 2. Education should be viewed not as a discreet phase in life, but rather as a process, sometimes formal and sometimes informal that goes on through life.
>
> 3. A college should not allow its role as certifier to the society to overshadow its primary role as educator of the community.
>
> 4. A community college should serve more as a change agent in the community than as a mirror of the community. (Collins,1975)

There can be no lasting authority without the approval of those governed, therefore, for any policy changes involving students to be effective, their participation will be necessary if coercion is to be eliminated. (Richardson, 1972) A number of administrators believe that student participation in governance serves to reduce disorder due to student activists. (MacGregor, 1973)

In order for student activists to have a cause, issues are a necessity. (Kenniston, 1971) When students have a voice in the setting of policy, issues for confrontation will remain at a minimum.

The stirrings and unrest of the nineteen-sixties influenced the formation of a Campus Governance Program to investigate nineteen campuses and find out what was required to quiet the unrest of the students, administrators and faculty. It was seen that shared authority in governance was a cure for faculty unrest, and that the time had now come to test its extension throughout all areas of the campus. In searching for formulas that might delineate those who had the right to govern, two that particularly affect the right of the student to participate in college governance came to the fore:

> 1. Those whose lives are most affected by the decision.
>
> 2. Those whose co-operation is essential to the effectiveness of the campus. (Keeton,1971:9)

If the participation of the learner is essential to the effectiveness of the campus, now is the time to study the effectiveness of the student as he participates in college governance.

Effectiveness of the Student in Community College Governance

"In higher education the co-operation of the learner is absolutely essential to good results." (Keeton, 1971:9)

His co-operation can be withheld in multitudinous ways, nevertheless, his potential for damaging campus effectiveness is less legitimate a reason to seek his participation, than is his potential for contributing to the college as a motivated, self actualizing individual.

How does the individual feel worthwhile and motivated to act in his own interests? Maslow (1954), in a study of motivation and personality of man, proposed the fulfillment of a heirarchy of needs as essential to his environment. Needs that were low on the heirarchy must be at least partially satisfied before those that are higher can become important after the prior needs have been met. The order in which Maslow proposed man's needs was:

Physiological needs: hunger, thirst, air.
Safety needs: to feel secure and safe, out of danger.
Belongingness and love needs: to affiliate with others, be accepted and belong.
Esteem needs: to achieve, be competent, gain approval and recognition.
Cognitive needs: to know, understand and explore.
Aesthetic needs: symmetry, order and beauty.
Self-actualization needs: to find self fulfillment and realize one's potential.

Maslow's theory supports the notion that the student's need for esteem must be met, in order for him to progress to realization of his full potential.

It was this theory of man's need to progress toward self-actualization that MacGregor and Herzberg elaborated on. Looking primarily at industrial settings, MacGregor (1960) set forth his Theory X and Theory Y views of human behavior.

In Theory X he made the assumption that man is outwardly directed; chiefly meeting lower levels of need; dislikes and avoids work, needing to be coerced and directed; will always look for security above ambition and self-direction.

In Theory Y he proposed the opposite assumption, postulating that man is inwardly directed, seeking the highest level of self-actualization needs; finds reward in the achievement of objectives; and exercises a high degree of imagination and creativity in the solution of problems. MacGregor clearly reveals his preference for Theory Y when he states that man will exercise self direction in the achievement of objectives to the degree that he is committed to those objectives and that commitment is a function of the self-esteem associated with the achievement.

Herzberg (1969) also built on Maslow's theory with his Two Factor Theory which divided man's needs into two categories, dissatisfiers or environmental needs, and satisfiers or self-actualization needs. He did not see man as being satisfied when the lower level needs were met, but believed these environmental needs would always need constant attention. A sense of achievement came from the satisfying of high-level needs and seeing the results of one's own efforts.

Colin (1971) goes beyond Theory Y with what he termed Theory Z. In looking at the business world he theorized that the desire for autonomy, creative tasks, and self-direction motivated the individual. He saw as necessary for progress,

a climate in which the individual had the opportunity to fully develop his potential through interaction of his ideas with peers and supervisors.

Vroom (1960) found that the more an individual participated in making decisions in his job, the more positive his attitude will be to that job. While many of these theories have been constructed with the business world as their object, they are equally applicable to the world of the community college student. If the co-operation of the learner is essential to education then it is vital to explore those situations in which the student's role in college governance can be effective.

PROCEDURES

A two-part questionnaire was utilized to ascertain students' perceptions of their role in college governance (Appendix C). Part one of the questionnaire, consisting of thirty items, was adapted from an instrument designed by Richardson (1969) and utilized previously in a study by Jones (1974). The second part of the questionnaire, consisting of seven items, was designed by the author. Before exposing the final student population to the instrument it was presented to a selected audience, consisting of three administrators, one faculty member, a secretary and three students. After a review of the instrument, suggestions and comments pursuant to its contents and administration were accepted and incorporated.

In part one of the questionnaire, students were asked to indicate their desire for involvement in each of thirty college activities, selecting one of five choices: 1) No student involvement, 2) Some student involvement, 3) Equal student involvement, 4) Largely under student control, and 5) Completely student controlled. In part two the students were asked to indicate their feeling about their own personal participation in college governance in seven areas, selecting one of two choices: 1) Agree, and 2) Disagree.

In order that the sample population selected be representative of the student population, it was decided to distribute the questionaire in a classroom setting to an equal number of full-time students attending vocational and academic classes, and part-time vocational or academic students. Fifty questionnaires were distributed to full-time students attending vocational classes, fifty questionnaires to full-time students attending academic classes and fifty questionnaires to part-time evening vocational or academic students. A student was considered full-time if he was taking twelve or more quarter credits at the time the questionnaire was administered.

A table of random numbers was utilized in selecting classes for distribution of the instrument (Burington, 1970). In each of the student categories, 1) vocational, 2) academic, and 3) part-time evening, all courses in the college catalogue were ordered numerically. Classes in each category were selected using the table of random numbers until a

sufficient number had been secured to guarantee the fifty students in each category. The questionnaire was administered to all students in a selected class, but in order to equalize the input, only the first fifty completed in each student category were analyzed.

On the first page of the instrument was a brief statement to the students asking for their participation, and informing them that the study was related to a problem that impacted every segment of the campus and was directed toward forming a more responsive, responsible student government. They in turn were offered a rough tally of the results before the end of quarter (Appendix E). This brief analysis was completed and forwarded to all participating instructors the last week of class.

The Dean of Students wrote a letter to each faculty member whose students were selected to participate in the study, asking for their help in administering the instrument (Appendix D). The letters were distributed, then several days later the author personally contacted each instructor by telephone to further explain the project. The instrument was administered in class by the instructor and returned to the author by campus mail.

RESULTS

The assessment of student opinion regarding their role in college governance at Everett Community College was accomplished by the use of a questionnaire. The one hundred and fifty students who responded to the thirty-seven questions asked included fifty vocational students, fifty academic students and fifty part-time students. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed and were displayed in terms of frequency and percentage response to each category for each question. Each table was numbered in the order in which the questions were presented in the instrument, and the title of the table reflected the basic nature of the question.

Table 1

Setting Institutional goals

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	3	6	15	30	28	56	4	8	0	0
Academic	5	10	9	19	27	56	6	13	1	2
Part-time	3	6	19	40	23	49	2	4	0	0
Total	11	8	43	30	78	54	12	8	1	1

Table 1 shows that the question was answered by all fifty vocational students. Six percent (3 students) did not want any involvement, while thirty percent (15 students) favored at least some involvement. Fifty-six percent (28 students) wanted equal involvement, and another eight percent (4 students) would like to see institutional goals largely student controlled. No student wanted to have complete student control.

Forty-eight of the academic students answered the question, with ten percent (5 students) wanting no student involvement, nineteen percent (9 students) wanting some student involvement, and fifty-six percent (27 students) wanting equal student involvement. Thirteen percent (6 students) favored academic goals being largely student controlled, while two percent (1 student) wanted total student control.

Of the forty-seven part-time students who answered the the question, six percent (3 students) did not want any student involvement, whereas forty percent (19 students) favoured some student involvement and forty-nine percent (23 students) wished for equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) looked for institutional goals to be largely student controlled and no part-time student was interested in total student control.

In summarizing the total student responses to the question, it can be seen that fifty-four percent (78 students) of the one hundred and forty-five respondents wanted an equal voice in setting institutional goals. Some involvement was

desired by thirty percent (43 students) whereas eight percent (12 students) wanted institutional goals to be largely student controlled. A further eight percent (11 students) did not want any student involvement and one percent (1 student) looked for total student control.

Table 2

Establishing Attendance Policies

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	3	6	11	22	21	42	9	18	6	12
Academic	7	14	12	24	22	44	8	16	1	2
Part-time	8	16	18	36	17	34	5	10	2	4
Total	18	12	41	27	60	40	22	15	9	6

Inspection of Table 2 reveals that all respondents in each student category answered this question. Six percent (3 students) in the vocational category wanted no involvement, while twenty-two percent (11 students) asked for some involvement and forty-two percent (21 students) thought involvement should be equal. Eighteen percent (9 students) felt attendance policies should be largely student controlled, and twelve percent (6 students) wanted total student control.

In the academic category fourteen percent (7 students) thought there should be no student involvement in attendance

policies, twenty-four percent (12 students) wanted to have some involvement, and forty-four percent (22 students) envisioned equal involvement. Sixteen percent (8 students) favored attendance policies being largely under student control, and two percent (1 student) wanted total control.

Of the part-time students sixteen percent (8 students) did not wish to be involved, thirty-six percent (18 students) saw some student involvement, with thirty-four percent (17 students) asking for equal involvement. Ten percent (5 students) wanted attendance policies to be largely student controlled, while four percent (2 students) desired total control.

Looking at the total responses to the question it can be seen that the majority of students, forty percent (60 students) favored equal involvement in establishing attendance policies. Next favored was having some student involvement by twenty-seven percent (41 students), with fifteen percent (22 students) seeking largely student controlled policies. Twelve percent (18 students) wanted no involvement and six percent (9 students) asked for total control.

Table 3

Student Publications

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	0	0	4	8	6	12	24	48	16	32
Academic	2	4	1	2	8	16	25	50	14	28
Part-time	2	4	4	8	10	20	25	51	8	16
Total	4	3	9	6	24	16	74	50	38	26

In observing Table 3 it can be seen that fifty students responded in both the vocational and academic category, and forty-nine students in the part-time category. No vocational student agreed to have no student involvement, though eight percent (4 students) agreed to some student involvement, and twelve percent (6 students) wanted equal student involvement. Forty-eight percent (24 students) wanted student publications to be largely under student control, and thirty-two percent (16 students) wanted total student control.

In the academic category four percent (2 students) did not want involvement, two percent (1 student) wanted some involvement, and sixteen percent (8 students) desired equal involvement. Fifty percent (25 students) wanted student publications to be largely under student control and twenty-eight percent (14 students) asked for total control.

Amongst the part-time students' responses, four

percent (2 students) did not want any student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) asked for some involvement and twenty percent (10 students) favored equal involvement. Fifty-one percent (25 students) advocated that student publications be largely student controlled while sixteen percent (8 students) demanded total student control in this area.

To summarize the degree of involvement advocated by the total 149 students who answered the question, fifty percent (74 students) favored student publications being largely student controlled, with twenty-six percent (38 students) preferring total student control. Sixteen percent (24 students) thought that equal student involvement in student publications was adequate whereas six percent (9 students) only desired some student involvement. Three percent (4 students) did not want to be at all involved in student publications.

Table 4

Selection of College president

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	7	15	11	23	16	33	6	13	8	17
Academic	9	18	12	24	18	36	4	8	7	14
Part-time	12	25	22	46	10	21	1	2	3	6
Total	28	19	45	31	44	30	11	8	18	12

Table 4 reveals that this question was answered by forty-eight of the vocational respondents. Fifteen percent (7 students) were against any student involvement, while twenty-three percent (11 students) asked for some student involvement, and thirty-three percent (16 students) agreed that students should be equally involved in the selection of the college president. Thirteen percent (6 students) favored the selection being largely student controlled while seventeen percent (8 students) supported total student control.

All fifty of the academic students responded to this question with eighteen percent (9 students) requesting no student involvement, twenty-four percent (12 students) looking for some student involvement, and thirty-six percent (18 students) recommending equal student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) believed the selection of the college president should be largely student controlled and fourteen percent (7 students) advocated that the selection be totally student controlled.

Forty-eight part-time students responded to the question with twenty-five percent (12 students) favoring no student involvement. Forty-six percent (22 students) wanted some student involvement and twenty-one percent (10 students) looked for equal student involvement in the selection of the college president. Only two percent (1 student) supported the selection being largely student controlled and six percent (3 students) advocated total student control.

A summary of the 146 responses to the selection of the college president shows that the majority of students, thirty-one percent (45 students) asked for some student involvement and thirty percent (44 students) favored equal student involvement. Nineteen percent (28 students) chose to have no student involvement, and twelve percent (18 students) desired that the choice be totally student controlled. Eight percent (11 students) agreed to have the selection largely student controlled.

Table 5

Selection of College Officials Directly Related to Student Affairs

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	2	4	6	12	16	33	18	37	7	14
Academic	4	8	8	16	23	46	13	26	2	4
Part-time	5	11	12	26	22	47	4	9	4	9
Total	11	8	26	18	61	42	35	24	13	9

In Table 5 it can be seen that forty-nine vocational students answered this question with four percent (2 students) choosing to have no student involvement, twelve percent (6 students) interested in some student involvement, and thirty-three percent (16 students) looking for equal student involvement. Thirty-seven percent (18 students) thought the

selection should be largely student controlled and fourteen percent (7 students) advocated total student control.

Once again, all fifty academic students responded to the question with eight percent (4 students) declining any student involvement and sixteen percent (8 students) requesting some student involvement. Forty-six percent (23 students) advocated equal student involvement in the selection of college officials whereas twenty-six percent (13 students) desired selection to be largely student controlled. Only four percent (2 students) thought that the selection should be totally student controlled.

Of the forty-seven part-time students who responded eleven percent (5 students) wanted no student involvement, twenty-six percent (12 students) looked for some student involvement, and forty-seven percent (22 students) favored equal student involvement. Nine percent (4 students) believed the selection should be largely student controlled and a further nine percent (4 students) maintained the selection should be totally student controlled.

The level of involvement indicated by the 146 students who answered the question showed a fairly even balance with forty-two percent (61 students) advocating equal involvement. This was followed by twenty-four percent (35 students) asking for the selection to be largely student controlled and eighteen percent (26 students) desiring some student control. Nine percent (13 students) insisted on total student control, while eight percent (11 students) felt that students should

not be involved in the selection.

Table 6

Allocation of Student Activities Fees

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	1	2	5	10	18	37	13	27	12	24
Academic	3	6	8	16	12	24	19	38	8	16
Part-time	4	8	12	24	21	43	11	22	1	2
Total	8	5	25	17	51	34	43	29	21	14

The inspection of Table 6 reveals that, of the forty-nine vocational students who responded, only two percent (1 student) felt that students should not be involved in the allocation and ten percent (5 students) desired at least some involvement. Thirty-seven percent (18 students) advocated equal student involvement and twenty-seven percent (13 students) maintained the allocation should be largely student controlled, while twenty-four percent (12 students) insisted on total student control.

All 50 academic students responded to the question, with six percent (3 students) showing no interest in student involvement, sixteen percent (9 students) agreeing that there should be some student involvement, twenty-four percent (12 students) supporting equal student involvement, thirty-eight

percent (19 students) looking for largely student control and sixteen percent (8 students) favoring total student control.

Of the forty-nine part-time students who responded, eight percent (4 students) were against any student involvement, twenty-four percent(12 students) felt that there should be some student involvement, and forty-three students (21 students) looked for equal student involvement. Twenty-two percent (11 students) advocated largely student controlled in allocation of student activity fees but only two percent (1 student) desired to have total control.

In summarizing the replies of the 148 students who responded to the question, the replies were again fairly balanced with thirty-four percent (51 students) advocating equal student involvement and twenty-nine percent (43 students) asking that allocation be largely student controlled. Seventeen percent (25 students) desired only some involvement. Fourteen percent (21 students) maintained that the allocation of student fees should be totally student controlled whereas five percent (8 students) chose to have no student involvement.

Table 7

Faculty Hiring

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	16	33	23	48	5	10	2	4	2	4
Academic	18	36	23	46	8	16	1	2	0	0
Part-time	25	50	19	38	5	10	0	0	1	2
Total	59	40	65	44	18	12	3	2	3	2

Table 7 reveals that forty-eight vocational students responded to the question with thirty-three percent (16 students) not interested in student involvement, forty-eight percent (23 students) asking for some student involvement, and ten percent (5 students) interested in equal involvement. Four percent (2 students) felt that faculty hiring should be largely student controlled, and similarly, four percent (2 students) advocated total student control.

Of the fifty academic students who responded, thirty-six percent (18 students) were not interested in student involvement in faculty hiring while forty-six percent (23 students) desired some student involvement and sixteen percent (8 students) wanted equal involvement. Just two percent (1 student) favored largely student controlled and no students wanted total control in this area.

All of the fifty part-time students questioned responded to this question, with fifty percent (25 students) not interested in student involvement, thirty-eight percent (19 students) advocating some student involvement, and ten percent (5 students) favoring equal student involvement. No students felt that faculty hiring should be largely student controlled and just two percent (1 student) insisted on total student control.

In summarizing the attitude of the 148 students toward faculty hiring, it can be seen that fifty-nine percent (40 students) want no student involvement and forty-four percent (65 students) were content with some student involvement. Twelve percent (18 students) advocated equal student involvement and two percent (3 students) advocated that faculty hiring be largely student controlled whereas a further two percent (3 students) demanded equal student control.

Table 8

Faculty Promotion

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	14	29	22	45	9	18	2	4	2	4
Academic	20	40	22	44	7	14	1	2	0	0
Part-time	26	52	14	28	9	18	0	0	1	2
Total	60	40	58	39	25	17	3	2	3	2

Table 8 shows that forty-nine vocational students responded to the question with twenty-nine percent (14 students) asking for no student involvement, forty-five percent (22 students) choosing to have some student involvement and eighteen percent (9 students) desiring equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) asked that faculty promotion should be largely student controlled and another four percent (2 students) recommended total student control.

The fifty academic students responded to the questionnaire with forty percent (20 students) looking for no student involvement, forty-four percent (22 students) seeking some student involvement and fourteen percent (7 students) advocating equal student involvement. Two percent (1 student) wanted faculty promotion largely student controlled and no students recommended total student control.

Of the fifty part-time students who responded, fifty-two percent (26 students) were against student involvement in faculty promotion, twenty-eight percent (14 students) allowed for some student involvement and eighteen percent (9 students) agreed to equal student involvement. No students saw faculty promotion as largely student controlled and just two percent (1 student) desired total student control.

Of the total 149 students who responded to the question, the majority, forty percent (60 students), desired no involvement in faculty promotion, thirty-nine percent (58 students) felt there should be some student involvement, and seventeen percent (25 students) asked for equal involvement.

Two percent (3 students) believed they should be largely student controlled and similarly two percent (3 students) advocated total student control.

Table 9

Allocation of Annual College Budget

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Total Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	11	22	18	37	16	33	3	6	1	2
Academic	12	24	26	52	10	20	1	2	1	2
Part-time	18	36	17	34	13	26	2	4	0	0
Total	41	28	61	41	39	26	6	4	2	1

In observing Table 9 it can be seen that forty-nine vocational students answered the question with twenty-two percent (11 students) wanting no involvement in the allocation of the annual college budget, whereas thirty-seven percent (18 students) desired some student involvement and thirty-three percent (16 students) favored equal student involvement. Six percent (3 students) saw allocation of the annual college budget as being largely student controlled and two percent (1 student) recommended total student control.

Fifty academic students responded to the question with twenty-four percent (12 students) desiring no student involvement in the allocation, and fifty-two percent (26

students) asking for some student involvement, and twenty percent (10 students) favoring equal student involvement. Two percent (1 student) saw allocation of the annual college budget as best being largely student controlled and another two percent (1 student) recommended total student control.

Fifty part-time students responded with thirty-six percent (18 students) declaring that there should be no student involvement, thirty-four percent (17 students) looking for some student involvement, and twenty-six percent (13 students) choosing equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) felt allocation of the annual college budget should be largely student controlled and no students desired total student control.

Through the total 149 responses to the question it can be seen that forty-one percent (61 students) favored some student involvement whereas twenty-eight percent (41 students) preferred to have no student involvement and twenty-six percent (39 students) asked for equal student involvement. Four percent (6 students) recommended the allocation be largely student controlled and just one percent (2 students) advocated total student control.

Table 10

Regulation of Student Conduct

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Total Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	1	2	4	8	18	37	20	41	6	12
Academic	1	2	3	6	26	53	15	31	4	8
Part-time	3	6	8	17	21	45	12	26	3	6
Total	5	3	15	10	65	45	47	32	13	9

Table 10 illustrates that forty-nine vocational students responded to the question with two percent (1 student) electing to have no student involvement, fourteen percent (7 students) desiring some student involvement, and forty-five percent (22 students) asking for equal involvement, Two percent (11 students) felt that regulation of student conduct should be largely student controlled and sixteen percent (8 students) advocated total student control.

Of the forty-eight academic students who responded to the question, six percent (3 students) chose to have no student involvement, whereas twenty-seven percent (13 students) were content with some student involvement, and fifty-six percent (27 students) advocated equal student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) looked for regulation to be largely student controlled and just two percent (1 student) demanded total

student control.

All fifty part-time students responded to the question with ten percent (5 students) not interested in student involvement, twenty-four percent (12 students) agreeing to some student involvement, and forty-six percent (23 students) favoring equal student involvement. Fourteen percent (7 students) advocated largely student control in the regulation of student conduct, whereas three percent (6 students) maintained that regulation should be totally student controlled.

In summarizing the attitudes of the 147 students who responded to the question, the majority of forty-nine percent (72 students) believed that there should be equal student control, with fifteen percent (22 students) recommending that regulation of student conduct should be largely student controlled and twenty-two percent choosing some student involvement. Eight percent (12 students) demanded total student control in the regulation of student conduct and six percent (9 students) chose not to be involved.

Table 11

Recognition of Student Organizations

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	1	2	4	8	18	37	20	41	6	12
Academic	1	2	3	6	26	53	15	31	4	8
Part-time	3	6	8	17	21	45	12	26	3	6
Total	5	3	15	10	65	45	47	32	13	9

In Table 11 it is seen that forty-nine vocational students responded to the question with just two percent (1 student) not desiring to be involved and eight percent (4 students) asking for some involvement. Thirty-seven percent (18 students) advocated equal student involvement in the recognition of student organizations and forty-one percent (20 students advocated that recognition of student organizations be largely student controlled, with twelve percent (6 students) demanding total student control.

Of the forty-nine academic students who responded, two percent (1 student) chose to have no involvement and six percent (3 students) asked for some student involvement, whereas fifty-three percent (26 students) supported equal student involvement. Thirty-one percent (15 students) maintained it should be largely student controlled and eight percent (4 students) supported total student control.

Forty-seven students in the part-time category responded, with six percent (3 students) choosing not to be involved, seventeen percent (8 students) electing to have some student involvement and forty-five percent (21 students) interested in equal student involvement. Twenty-six percent (12 students) chose to have largely student control and just six percent (3 students) maintained there should be total student control.

In summarizing the views of the 145 students who answered the question it can be seen that forty-five percent (65 students) advocated equal student involvement and thirty-two percent (47 students) felt that recognition of a student organization should be largely student controlled. Ten percent (15 students) were interested in some student involvement, whereas nine percent (13 students) advocated total student control and three percent (5 students) chose to have no student involvement.

Table 12

Approval of Guest Speakers
Invited by Students

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	2	4	3	6	15	31	15	31	13	27
Academic	2	4	3	6	16	33	20	42	7	15
Part-time	2	4	9	18	20	40	13	26	6	12
Total	6	4	15	10	51	35	48	33	26	18

Inspection of Table 12 reveals that the question was answered by forty-eight vocational students of whom four percent (2 students) showed no interest in student involvement, six percent (3 students) wanted some student involvement, and thirty-one percent (15 students) supported equal student involvement. Thirty-one percent (15 students) felt that approval of guest speakers must be largely student controlled and twenty-seven percent (13 students) looked for total student control.

Of the forty-eight academic students who responded to the question, four percent (2 students) chose no student involvement, six percent (3 students) selected some student involvement, and thirty-three percent (16 students) were interested in equal student involvement. Forty-two percent (20 students) believed that approval of guest speakers invited by

students should be largely student controlled, and just fifteen percent (7 students) maintained that the approval must be totally student controlled.

All fifty part-time students responded to the question with four percent (2 students) choosing not to be involved, eighteen percent (9 students) desiring some involvement, and forty percent (20 students) looking for equal student involvement. Twenty-six percent (13 students) asked for approval of guest speakers to be largely student controlled and twelve percent (6 students) desired to have total student control.

From a review of the total of 146 responses it can be seen that thirty-five percent (51 students) felt that students should have an equal degree of involvement in the approval of guest speakers invited by students, whereas thirty-three percent (48 students) felt that this area should be largely student controlled and eighteen percent (26 students) demanded equal student control. Four percent (6 students) declined any student involvement and ten percent (15 students) elected to have some student involvement.

Table 13

Teaching Loads

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	15	31	10	21	16	33	3	6	4	8
Academic	15	31	21	44	10	21	2	4	0	0
Part-time	21	42	16	32	10	20	2	4	1	2
Total	51	35	47	32	36	25	7	5	5	3

Table 13 shows that the question was answered by forty-eight vocational students with thirty-one percent (15 students) choosing to have no student involvement, twenty-one percent (10 students) looking for some student involvement, and thirty-three percent (16 students) advocating equal student involvement. Six percent (3 students) felt that teaching loads should be largely student controlled and eight percent (4 students) favored teaching loads being totally student controlled.

Of the academic students questioned, 48 responded, with thirty-one percent (15 students) choosing to have no student involement, forty-four percent (21 students) wanting to have some student involvement and twenty-one percent (10 students) favoring equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) felt that teaching loads should be largely student controlled but no student looked for total control here.

All fifty part-time students responded to this question with forty-two percent (21 students) maintaining that there should be no student involvement in teaching loads, while thirty-two percent (15 students) sought some students involvement, and twenty percent (10 students) advocated equal involvement. Only four percent (2 students) felt that teaching loads should be largely student controlled and two percent (1 student) supported total student control.

In summarizing the views of the 146 students who responded it can be seen that thirty-five percent (51 students) chose to have no student involvement in teaching loads, with thirty-two percent (47 students) advocating some student involvement and twenty-five percent (36 students) interested in equal student involvement. Five percent (7 students) wanted teaching loads to be largely student controlled and three percent (5 students) desired total student control.

Table 14

Class Size

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Invlovement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	11	23	7	15	19	40	8	17	3	6
Academic	11	22	26	53	10	20	2	4	0	0
Part-time	13	27	16	33	14	29	4	8	2	4
Total	35	24	49	34	43	29	14	10	5	3

Table 14 illustrates that, of the forty-eight vocational responses, twenty-three percent (11 students) chose to have no student involvement, but fifteen percent (7 students) favored some student involvement and forty percent (19 students) looked for equal student involvement. Seventeen percent (8 students) advocated class size being largely student controlled and six percent (3 students) recommended total student control.

In the academic area, forty-nine students responded with twenty-two percent (11 students) asking for no student involvement, while fifty-three percent (26 students) favored some student involvement, with twenty percent (10 students) asking for equal student involvement. Just four percent (2 students) recommended class size be largely student controlled and no students supported total student control.

Forty-nine part-time students responded to the question with twenty-seven percent (13 students) opposed to any student involvement, thirty-three percent (16 students) interested in some student involvement, and twenty-nine percent (14 students) advocating equal student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) wanted students to largely control class size and four percent (2 students) believed students should have total control.

In observing the 146 total responses, it can be seen that thirty-four percent (49 students) supported some student involvement, whereas twenty-nine percent (43 students) selected equal student involvement and twenty-four percent (35

students) asked for more student involvement. Ten percent (14 students) advocated class size as being largely student controlled and three percent (5 students) advocated total student control in this area.

Table 15

Alterations in College Calendar

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	7	14	11	22	25	51	4	8	2	4
Academic	4	8	18	38	22	46	3	6	1	2
Part-time	8	16	24	48	14	28	3	6	1	2
Total	19	13	53	36	61	41	10	7	4	3

In observing Table 15 it can be seen that forty-nine vacational students responded with fourteen percent (7 students) seeking no student involvement, twenty-two percent (11 students) looking to have some student involvement, and fifty-one percent (25 students) maintaining that they desired to have equal student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) wanted alterations in the college calendar to be largely under student control with four percent (2 students) demanding total control.

In the academic area forty-eight students responded, with eight percent (4 students) electing to have no student

involvement, and thirty-eight percent (18 students) choosing to have some student involvement. Forty-six percent(22 students) were interested in equal student involvement, six percent (3 students) asked that the alterations be allowed to be largely student controlled and two percent (1 student) advocated total student control.

Fifty part-time students responded to the question, with sixteen percent (8 students) feeling that there should be no student involvement, whereas forty-eight percent (24 students) believed in some student involvement and twenty-eight percent (14 students) were interested in equal student involvement. Six percent (3 students) wanted largely student control and two percent (1 student) advocated total control.

Summarizing the attitudes of the 147 respondents to the question, it can be seen that forty-one percent (61 students) advocated equal student involvement and thirty-six percent (53 students) chose to have some student involvement, while thirteen percent (19 students) elected to have no student involvement. Seven percent (10 students) felt that alterations in the college calendar should be largely student controlled, but only three percent (4 students) recommended total student control.

Table 16

Distribution of Student-Initiated Literature on Campus

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	2	4	2	4	17	35	17	35	11	22
Academic	2	4	2	4	26	53	12	24	7	14
Part-time	3	6	5	11	15	32	19	40	5	11
Total	7	5	9	6	58	40	48	33	23	16

In Table 16 it can be seen that, of the forty-nine vocational students who responded to the question, four percent (2 students) chose to have no student involvement and another four percent (2 students) desired some student involvement, whereas thirty-five percent (17 students) favored equal student involvement. A further thirty-five percent (17 students) supported distribution of student-initiated literature on campus being largely student controlled, with twenty-two percent (11 students) looking for total student control.

In the academic area, forty-nine students responded, of which four percent (2 students) desired no student involvement and a further four percent (2 students) sought some student involvement, while fifty-three percent (26 students) were interested in equal student involvement. Twenty-four

percent (12 students) asked that the distribution be largely student controlled and fourteen percent (7 students) supported total student control.

In the part-time area forty-seven students responded, with six percent (3 students) asking for no student involvement, eleven percent (5 students) feeling they ought to have some student involvement, and thirty-two percent (15 students) supporting equal student involvement. Forty percent (19 students) looked for distribution of student-initiated literature on campus to be largely student controlled and eleven percent (5 students) wanted to see total student control.

In summarizing the attitudes of the 145 respondents, it can be seen that forty percent (58 students) advocated equal student involvement, with thirty-three percent (48 students) favoring largely student control, and sixteen percent (23 students) looking for total student control. Six percent (9 students) selected some student involvement and five percent (7 students) chose to have no student involvement in this area.

Table 17

Distribution of Off-Campus Literature on Campus

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	6	12	5	10	27	55	7	14	4	8
Academic	4	8	12	24	22	45	8	16	3	6
Part-time	7	14	16	33	20	41	4	8	2	4
Total	17	12	33	22	69	47	19	13	9	6

Inspection of Table 17 reveals that forty-nine students in each student category responded to the question. In the vocational area, twelve percent (6 students) chose to have no student involvement, ten percent (5 students) looked for some student involvement, and fifty-five percent (27 students) favored equal involvement. Fourteen percent (7 students) advocated largely student control and eight percent demanded total student control.

In the academic area, eight percent (4 students) felt they wanted no student involvement, whereas twenty-four percent (12 students) believed in some student involvement and forty-five percent (22 students) advocated equal student involvement. Sixteen percent (8 students) wanted the distribution to be largely student controlled and six percent (3 students) asked for total control.

In the part-time area, fourteen percent (7 students) selected to have no involvement, thirty-three percent (16 students) suggested some student involvement, and forty-one percent (20 students) looked for equal student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) felt the distribution should be largely student controlled and four percent (2 students) supported total student control.

In summarizing the total of 147 responses to the question, it can be seen that forty-seven percent (69 students) advocated equal student involvement and twenty-two percent (33 students) were interested in some student involvement, whereas thirteen percent (19 students) wanted distribution of off-campus literature on campus to be largely student controlled. Twelve percent (17 students) were against any student involvement, contrasting with six percent (9 students, who advocated total student control.

Table 18

Teacher Salaries

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	26	53	16	33	5	10	0	0	2	4
Academic	25	51	19	39	5	10	0	0	0	0
Part-time	41	84	5	10	2	4	0	0	1	2
Total	92	63	40	27	12	8	0	0	3	2

Table 18 shows that the question was answered by forty-nine students in each category. In the vocational area, Fifty-three percent (26 students) were opposed to any student involvement, thirty-three percent (16 students) believed that there should be some student involvement, whereas ten percent (5 students) supported equal student involvement. No student wanted to largely control teacher salaries and four percent (2 students) still looked for total control.

In the academic area, fifty-one percent (25 students) were against any student involvement, thirty-nine percent were interested in some student involvement and just ten percent (5 students) favored equal student involvement. No students were interested in either largely or total student control.

In the part-time category, eighty-four percent (41 students) were opposed to student involvement, whereas ten percent (5 students) favored some student involvement with four percent(2 students) interested in equal student involvement. Again, no students were interested in largely controlling teacher salaries and only two percent (1 student) desired to have total control in this area.

Of the total 147 students who responded to the question, sixty-three percent (92 students) were against students being involved in teacher salaries, twenty-seven percent (40 students) desired to have some student involvement, and only eight percent (12 students) were interested in equal student involvement. In no student category was there any interest

in students largely controlling teacher salaries, although two percent (3 students) still preferred total control of teachers' salaries.

Table 19

Requirements for Degrees and Certificates

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	12	24	14	29	22	45	0	0	1	2
Academic	14	29	20	41	12	24	3	6	0	0
Part-time	16	33	18	38	12	25	2	4	0	0
Total	42	29	52	36	46	32	5	3	1	1

Table 19 illustrates that forty-nine vocational students responded to the question, with twenty-four percent (12 students) opposed to student involvement, twenty-nine percent (14 students) desiring some student involvement, and forty-five percent (22 students) advocating equal student involvement. No students wished to be largely controlling, although two percent (1 student) had requested total student control.

Of the forty-nine students who responded in the academic area, twenty-nine percent (14 students) were against student involvement, with forty-one percent (20 students) interested in some student involvement, and twenty-four percent (12 students) looking for equal student involvement.

Just six percent (3 students) thought that the requirements should be largely student controlled and no students desired total control.

In the part-time category, forty-eight students responded, with thirty-three percent (18 students) choosing to have some student involvement and twenty-five percent (12 students) agreeing that there should be equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) did feel that the requirements for degrees and certificates should be largely student controlled, whereas no part-time student wanted total control in this area.

The total of 146 responses to the question revealed that thirty-six percent (52 students) were interested in having some student involvement, with thirty-two percent (46 students) looking for equal student involvement and twenty-nine percent (42 students) totally against any student involvement. Three percent (5 students) did feel that the requirements should be largely student controlled and just one percent (1 student) believed in total student control.

Table 20

Release of Student Records

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	9	18	5	10	22	45	3	6	10	20
Academic	11	23	7	15	14	29	7	15	9	19
Part-time	11	22	10	20	18	36	6	12	5	10
Total	31	21	22	15	54	37	16	11	24	16

Observing Table 20, it can be seen that, in the vocational area, forty-nine students responded to the question, with eighteen percent (9 students) totally against student involvement, ten percent (5 students) wishing for some student involvement, and forty-five percent (22 students) advocating equal involvement. Six percent (3 students) wanted students to largely control the release of student records and twenty percent (10 students) demanded total control in this area.

Forty-eight academic students responded to the question, where twenty-three percent (11 students) selected to have no student control, fifteen percent (7 students) favored some control, and twenty-nine percent (14 students) chose to have equal control. Fifteen percent (7 students) would like to see release of student records largely student controlled

and nineteen percent (9 students) supported total control of student records.

Fifty part-time students responded to this question, with twenty-two percent (11 students) against student involvement, twenty percent (10 students) seeking some student involvement and thirty-six percent (18 students) advocating equal student involvement. Twelve percent (6 students) wanted the release of student records to be largely student controlled and ten percent (5 students) would like to see total student control.

Summarizing the attitudes of the 147 students who responded to the question, it can be seen that thirty-seven percent (54 students) favored equal student involvement and twenty-one percent (31 students were against any student involvement, whereas sixteen percent (24 students) demanded total student involvement. Fifteen percent (22 students) asked for some student involvement and eleven percent (16 students) wanted release of students' records to be largely under student control.

Table 21

Admission Standards for Curricula and Courses

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	11	23	12	25	21	44	3	6	1	2
Academic	13	28	13	28	17	36	3	6	1	2
Part-time	13	27	22	45	14	29	0	0	0	0
Total	37	26	47	33	52	36	6	4	2	1

In observing Table 21 it can be seen that forty-eight vocational students responded to this question with twenty-three percent (11 students) being opposed to student involvement, twenty-five percent (12 students) in favor of some student involvement, and forty-four percent (21 students) wanting equal involvement. Six percent (3 students) were in favor of admission standards for curricula and courses being largely student controlled and two percent (1 student) asked for total student control.

Of the forty-seven academic students who answered the question, twenty-eight percent (13 students) were against student involvement, a further twenty-eight percent (13 studnets) desired to see some student involvement, and thirty-six percent (17 students) looked for equal student involvement. Six percent (3 students) saw admission standards for

curricula and courses as being largely student controlled, and two percent (1 student) advocated total student control.

Forty-nine part-time students responded, with twenty-seven percent (13 students) seeking no student involvement, forty-five percent (22 students) agreeing to some student involvement, and twenty-nine percent (14 students) desiring equal student involvement. No part-time student felt that admission standards for curricula and courses should be largely or totally student controlled.

Looking at the total of 144 students who responded to the question, thirty-six percent (52 students) advocated equal student involvement, while thirty-three percent (47 students) looked for some student involvement, and twenty-six percent (37 students) were against having any student involvement at all. Four percent (6 students) believed that admission standards for curricula and courses should be largely student controlled, and just one percent (2 students) advocated total student control.

Table 22

Curricula or Course Revision, Addition, Deletion

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	7	14	13	26	24	48	6	12	0	0
Academic	6	12	19	39	20	41	3	6	1	2
Part-time	9	19	19	40	16	34	3	6	0	0
Total	22	15	51	35	60	41	12	8	1	1

Inspection of Table 22 shows that all fifty of the vocational respondents answered the question. Fourteen percent (7 students) did not wish to have any student involvement, twenty-six percent (13 students) asked for some student involvement, and forty-eight percent (24 students) advocated equal student involvement. Twelve percent (6 students) wanted curricula or course revision to be largely student controlled and no students were looking for total student control.

In the academic area forty-nine students responded to the question, with twelve percent (6 students) seeking no student involvement, thirty-nine percent (19 students) favoring at least some student involvement, and forty-one percent (20 students) looking for equal student involvement. Six percent (3 students) felt this area should be largely student

controlled and just two percent (1 student) demanded total student control.

The forty-seven responding part-time students were divided, with nineteen percent (9 students) opposed to student involvement, forty percent (19 students) favoring some student involvement, and thirty-four percent (16 students) interested in equal student involvement. Six percent (3 students) looked for this area to be largely student controlled, and no students desired to have total control.

Summarizing the 146 responses to this question, it can be seen that forty-one percent (60 students) advocated equal student involvement, with thirty-five percent (51 students) asking for at least some student involvement. Fifteen percent (22 students) were opposed to any student involvement, eight percent (12 students) wanted curricula or course revision, addition or deletion to be largely student controlled and just one percent (1 student) was looking for total control.

Table 23

Allocation of Student Financial Aid

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	9	18	13	27	24	49	3	6	0	0
Academic	7	14	21	43	19	39	2	4	0	0
Part-time	8	16	17	35	22	45	2	4	0	0
Total	24	16	51	35	65	44	7	5	0	0

Table 23 shows that, in each student category, forty-nine students responded to the question asked. In the vocational area, eighteen percent (9 students) were against any involvement, twenty-seven percent (13 students) looked for some involvement, and forty-nine percent (24 students) advocated equal student involvement. Six percent (3 students) looked for allocation of student financial aid to be largely student controlled but no students were desirous of total control.

In the academic area, fourteen percent (7 students) were opposed to any student involvement, forty-three percent (21 students) favored at least some student involvement, and thirty-nine percent (19 students) advocated equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) looked for this area to be largely student controlled and no students advocated total student control.

Sixteen percent (8 students) in the part-time category

were against any student control, thirty-five percent (17 students) wanted to see some student involvement, and forty-five percent (22 students) advocated equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) thought this area should be largely student controlled, but no student wished to have total control.

The degree of student involvement advocated by the total 147 students who responded to the question shows that forty-four percent (65 students) advocated equal student involvement, while thirty-five percent (51 students) would like to see some student involvement and sixteen percent (24 students) were opposed to any student involvement. Five percent (7 students) wished to see allocation of student financial aid largely student controlled, but no student in any category saw this as an area requiring total student control.

Table 24

Student Probation and Suspension Policies

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	2	4	10	21	27	56	6	13	3	6
Academic	7	14	17	35	24	49	0	0	1	2
Part-time	6	12	18	37	23	47	2	4	0	0
Total	15	10	45	31	74	51	8	5	4	3

As illustrated in Table 24, the results of this question showed that forty-eight students in the vocational category answered, with just four percent (2 students) against any student involvement, twenty-one percent (10 students) agreeing to some student involvement, while fifty-six percent (27 students) advocated equal student involvement. Thirteen percent (6 students) saw student probation and suspension policies as an area that should be largely student controlled and six percent (3 students) looked for total student control.

In the academic category, of the forty-nine students who responded, fourteen percent (7 students) asked for no student involvement, thirty-five percent (17 students) looked for some student involvement, and forty-nine percent (24 students) favored equal student involvement. No students saw this area as being largely student controlled, although two percent (1 student) did look for total student control.

In the part-time area, where forty-nine students responded, twelve percent (6 students) elected to have no student involvement, thirty-seven percent (18 students wished for some student involvement, and forty-seven percent (23 students) supported equal involvement. Four percent (2 students) looked for this area to be largely student controlled and no student thought that total control was required.

From the total of the 146 responses it can be seen that fifty-one percent (74 students) advocated equal student involvement, while thirty-one percent (45 students) looked for

some student involvement and ten percent (15 students) were against any student involvement. Five percent (8 students) saw student probation and suspension policies as needing to be largely under student control, and three percent (4 students) felt that these policies should be totally student controlled.

Table 25

Development of Campus Physical Facilities

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	5	10	11	23	27	56	5	10	0	0
Academic	4	8	13	27	25	52	4	8	2	4
Part-time	7	14	17	35	21	43	4	8	0	0
Total	16	11	41	28	73	50	13	9	2	1

Of the forty-eight vocational students who responded, ten percent (5 students) desired no student involvement, twenty-three percent (11 students) requested at least some student involvement, and fifty-six percent (27 students) considered equal student involvement. Ten percent (5 students) advocated largely student control, and no student favored total student control of facility development.

Forty-eight academic students responded, with eight percent (4 students) showing preference for no student

involvement, twenty-seven percent (13 students) needing at least some student involvement, and fifty-two percent (25 students) wanting equal student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) favored largely student control, and four percent (2 students) asked for total student control.

In the part-time category, forty-nine students responded; fourteen percent (7 students) wished for no student involvement, thirty-five percent (17 students) looked for at least some student involvement, and forty-three percent (21 students) elected to have equal involvement. Eight percent (4 students) sought for largely student control, and no student cared for total control.

Looking at the total 145 responses to the question, it is seen that fifty percent (73 students) favored equal involvement in the development of campus physical facilities, and twenty-eight percent (41 students) asked for at least some involvement. Eleven percent (16 students) did not desire any involvement, while nine percent (13 students) advocated largely student control of facility development and one percent (2 students) asked for total student control.

Table 26

Determining Administrative Structure of the College

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	15	30	15	30	18	36	2	4	0	0
Academic	11	23	22	46	13	27	2	4	0	0
Part-time	17	35	24	49	7	14	1	2	0	0
Total	43	29	61	41	38	26	5	3	0	0

Fifty students in the vocational category responded to this question, with thirty percent (15 students) against any student involvement, thirty percent (15 students) seeking some student involvement, and thirty-six percent (18 students) advocating equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) felt the area should be largely student controlled but no students wished to have total control.

In the academic area, forty-eight students responded to the question, with twenty-three percent (11 students) against any student involvement, forty-six percent (22 students) electing to have some student involvement, and twenty-seven percent (13 students) favoring equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) looked for this area to be largely student controlled but, again, no students wanted to have total control.

Forty-nine students responded in the part-time area, with thirty-five percent (17 students) electing to have no student involvement, while forty-nine percent (24 students) thought that there should be at least some student involvement, and fourteen percent (7 students) favored equal student involvement. Two percent (1 student) wanted to see the determination of the administrative structure of the college largely student controlled and, again, no students wanted total control.

Summarizing the responses from the 147 replies to the question, it is seen that forty-one percent (61 students) would like to see some student involvement, while twenty-nine percent (43 students) were against any student involvement at all. Twenty-six percent (38 students) felt that students should be equally involved in determining the administrative structure of the college, though only three percent (5 students) felt this area should be largely student controlled, and no student in any category looked for total control.

Table 27

Planning Commencement Exercises

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	3	6	5	10	25	51	12	24	4	8
Academic	3	6	5	10	18	37	19	39	4	8
Part-time	5	10	9	18	21	43	11	22	3	6
Total	11	7	19	13	64	44	42	29	11	7

Each student category had forty-nine respondents to the question. In the vocational area, six percent (3 students) elected to have no student involvement, ten percent (5 students) favored some student involvement, while fifty-one percent (25 students) elected to have equal student involvement. Twenty-four percent (12 students) felt that planning commencement exercises should be largely student controlled, and eight percent (4 students) looked for total control.

In the academic area six percent (3 students) were against any student involvement, ten percent (5 students) favored some student involvement, thirty-seven percent (18 students) favored equal student involvement, and thirty-nine percent (19 students) advocated that commencement exercises be largely student controlled. Eight percent (4 students) looked for this area to be under total student control.

In the part-time category, ten percent (5 students) elected to have no student involvement, eighteen percent (9 students) preferred some student involvement, while forty-three percent (21 students) revealed that they desired equal student involvement. Twenty-two percent (11 students) felt that planning commencement exercises should be largely student controlled and six percent (3 students) desired to have total control.

Summarizing the attitudes of 147 respondents to the question, forty-four percent (64 students) advocated equal student involvement, twenty-nine percent (42 students) believed that the planning of commencement exercises should be largely student controlled, while thirteen percent (19 students) felt that there should be at least some student involvement. Seven percent (11 students) felt that planning commencement exercises must be totally under student control while a similar seven percent (11 students) were totally opposed to any student involvement in this area.

Table 28

College Publications

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	3	6	11	22	20	41	9	18	6	12
Academic	1	2	3	6	25	51	15	31	5	10
Part-time	5	10	7	15	18	38	16	33	2	4
Total	9	6	21	14	63	43	40	27	13	9

Inspection of Table 28 shows that forty-nine vocational students responded to the question, with six percent (3 students) electing to have no student involvement, twenty-two percent (11 students) desiring at least some student involvement, and forty-one percent (20 students) advocating equal student involvement. Eighteen percent (9 students) saw college publications as being largely under student control while twelve percent (6 students) demanded total student control.

In the academic area, forty-nine students responded with two percent (1 student) wishing not to be involved, six percent (3 students) seeking some student involvement, while fifty-one percent (25 students) were interested in equal student involvement. Thirty-one percent (15 students) saw college publications as largely under student control, and ten percent (5 students) desired total control in this area.

Forty-eight part-time students responded to the question, with ten percent (5 students) against any student involvement, fifteen percent (7 students) interested in some student involvement, and thirty-eight percent (18 students) who wished to see equal student involvement. Thirty-three percent (16 students) desired that college publications be largely under student control, while just four percent (2 students) sought total student control.

In looking at the responses of the total 148 students, it can be seen that forty-three percent (63 students) advocated equal student involvement, whereas twenty-seven percent (40 students) believed that college publications should be largely under student control and fourteen percent (21 students) asked for some student involvement. Nine percent (13 students) looked for total student control, whereas six percent (9 students) were opposed to any student involvement at all.

Table 29

Establishing Grading Policies

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	11	23	13	27	20	42	2	4	2	4
Academic	10	20	22	45	13	27	4	8	0	0
Part-time	11	22	21	43	16	33	1	2	0	0
Total	32	22	56	38	49	34	7	5	2	1

Inspection of Table 29 shows that forty-eight vocational students responded to the question, with twenty-three percent (11 students) against any student involvement, twenty-seven percent (13 students) favoring some student involvement, and forty-two percent (20 students looking for equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) saw the establishment of grading policy as being largely under student control, while a similar four percent (2 students) felt that this area should be totally under student control.

In the academic area, forty-nine students responded, with twenty percent (10 students) seeking no student involvement and forty-five percent (22 students) looking for some student involvement, while twenty-seven percent (13 students) favored equal student involvement. Eight percent (4 students) felt that establishing grading policies should be largely student controlled, while no students wanted to have total control.

Of the forty-nine part-time students responding, twenty-two percent (11 students) elected to have no student involvement, while forty-three percent (21 students) felt there should be some student involvement, and thirty-three percent (16 students) favored equal student involvement. Two percent (1 student) felt the area should be largely student controlled, although no student wanted total control of the area.

The 146 responses regarding the attitude of students toward the establishment of grading policies shows that

thirty-eight percent (56 students) asked for some student involvement, while thirty-four percent (49 students) favored equal student involvement. Twenty-two percent (32 students) elected to have no student involvement. Five percent (7 students) wanted the establishment of grading policies to be largely student controlled and one percent (2 students) sought total student control.

Table 30

Faculty Evaluations

Student Category	No Student Involvement		Some Student Involvement		Equal Student Involvement		Largely Student Controlled		Totally Student Controlled	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Vocational	7	14	8	16	17	35	5	10	12	24
Academic	10	20	8	16	18	37	7	14	6	12
Part-time	6	12	17	35	22	45	2	4	2	4
Total	23	16	33	22	57	39	14	10	20	14

Inspection of Table 30 reveals that in each student category there were forty-nine responses to the question asked. In the vocational area, fourteen percent (7 students) were against any student involvement, while sixteen percent (8 students) looked for some student involvement and thirty-five percent (17 students) advocated equal student involvement. Ten percent (5 students) felt faculty evaluations should be largely student controlled, and twenty-four percent (12

students) believed this area must be under total student control.

In the academic area, twenty percent (10 students) elected to have no involvement, sixteen percent (8 students) looked for some student involvement, while thirty-seven percent (18 students) asked for equal student involvement. Fourteen percent (7 students) wanted to see faculty evaluations largely student controlled, and twelve percent (6 students) desired total student control.

Of the part-time students who responded, twelve percent (6 students) elected to have no student involvement, thirty-five percent (17 students) favored some student involvement and forty-five percent (22 students) looked for equal student involvement. Four percent (2 students) saw faculty evaluations as being largely under student control and a similar four percent (2 students) advocated total student control.

Looking at the total 147 responses to the question, it can be seen that the majority of the students, thirty-nine percent (47 students) favored equal student involvement in faculty evaluations, twenty-two percent (33 students) desired at least some student involvement, and sixteen percent (23 students) were opposed to any student involvement. Ten percent (14 students) looked for faculty evaluations to be largely student controlled while fourteen percent (20 students) asked for total control of this area.

Table 31

I Feel That More Student Participation in College Government Would Make No Difference in How the College is Run

Student Category	Agree		Disagree	
	f	%	f	%
Vocational	19	40	29	60
Academic	10	22	36	78
Part-time	15	31	33	69
Total	44	31	98	69

Inspection of Table 31 reveals that, in the vocational area, forty-eight students responded, with forty percent (19 students) agreeing with the statement, and sixty percent (29 students) disagreeing. In the academic area forty-six students responded, with twenty-two percent (10 students) agreeing, and seventy-eight percent (36 students) disagreeing. Forty-eight part-time students responded, with thirty-one percent (15 students) agreeing and sixty-nine percent (33 students disagreeing. Looking at the total replies from the 142 students who responded, sixty-nine percent (98 students) agreed with the statement while thirty-one percent (44 students) disagreed.

Table 32

I am Currently Participating in Our College Government

Student Category	Agree		Disagree	
	f	%	f	%
Vocational	5	11	42	89
Academic	7	15	39	85
Part-time	6	12	42	88
Total	18	13	123	87

In observing Table 32 it can be seen that, in the vocational area, forty-seven students responded, where eleven percent (5 students) agreed with the statement, while eighty-nine percent (42 students) disagreed. In the academic area forty-six students responded, with fifteen percent (7 students) agreeing and eighty-five percent (39 students) disagreeing. Forty-eight part-time students responded, of which twelve percent (6 students) showed agreement, and eighty-eight percent (42 students) showed disagreement. Of the total 141 responses, eighty-seven percent (123 students) disagreed with the statement, while thirteen percent (18 students) agreed.

Table 33

I Have Very Little Knowledge About College Government

Student Category	Agree		Disagree	
	f	%	f	%
Vocational	31	65	17	35
Academic	35	73	13	27
Part-time	35	71	14	29
Total	101	70	44	30

Table 33 illustrates that, in the vocational area, forty-eight students responded, with sixty-five percent (31 students) showing agreement with the statement and thirty-five percent (17 students) disagreeing. Forty-eight academic students responded, with seventy-three percent (35 students) showing agreement and twenty-seven percent (13 students) showing disagreement. Forty-nine part-time students responded, with seventy-one percent (35 students) showing agreement and twenty-nine percent (14 students) showing disagreement. Summarizing the responses from the total of 145 students who answered the question, seventy percent (101 students) agreed with the statement while thirty percent (44 students) disagreed with the question.

Table 34

I Have Very Little Knowledge About Student Body Activities At Our College

Student Category	Agree		Disagree	
	f	%	f	%
Vocational	31	65	17	35
Academic	27	57	20	43
Part-time	39	80	10	20
Total	97	67	47	33

Looking At Table 34, it can be seen that forty-eight vocational students responded, with sixty-five percent (31 students) in agreement with the statement, and thirty-five percent (17 students) in disagreement. In the academic area, forty-seven students responded, with fifty-seven percent (27 students) agreeing and forty-three percent (20 students) disagreed. Forty-nine part-time students responded, with eighty percent (39 students) showing agreement and twenty percent (10 students) disagreeing. Looking at the total 144 students who responded, it can be seen that sixty-seven percent (97 students) agreed with the statement, while thirty-three percent (47 students) disagreed.

Table 35

I Am Fully Aware of the Funding Available For Student Body Activities

Student Category	Agree		Disagree	
	f	%	f	%
Vocational	9	19	39	81
Academic	4	9	43	91
Part-time	9	18	40	82
Total	22	15	122	85

Table 35 shows that, in the vocational area, forty-eight students responded, with nineteen percent (9 students) showing agreement, and eighty-one percent (39 students) showing disagreement with the statement. Forty-seven academic students responded with nine percent (4 students) showing agreement and ninety-one percent (43 students) showing disagreement. Forty-nine part-time students responded, of which eighteen percent (9 students) agreed while eighty-two percent (40 students) disagreed. In summarizing the total 144 responses, it can be seen that eighty-five percent (122 students) showed disagreement with the statement while fifteen percent (22 students) showed agreement.

Table 36

I Would Like to Have a Voice in the Allocation of Student Body Funds

Student Category	Agree		Disagree	
	f	%	f	%
Vocational	24	51	23	49
Academic	28	62	17	38
Part-time	15	32	32	68
Total	67	48	72	52

Table 36 reveals that, in the vocational area, forty-seven students responded, with fifty-one percent (24 students) showing agreement with the statement and forty-nine percent (23 students) showing disagreement. In the academic area, forty-five responses were noted, with sixty-two percent (28 students) agreeing with the statement, while thirty-eight percent (17 students) disagreed. Forty-seven part-time students replied to the question, wherein thirty-two percent (15 students) agreed and sixty-eight percent (32 students) disagreed. Summarizing the total of 139 responses, it can be seen that fifty-two percent (72 students) did agree with the statement, while forty-eight percent (67 students) disagreed.

Table 37

I Would Enjoy Being on a Committee to Investigate Whether Current Student Body Activities Meet Student Needs

Student Category	Agree		Disagree	
	f	%	f	%
Vocational	16	33	33	67
Academic	23	49	24	51
Part-time	12	25	36	75
Total	51	35	93	65

In observing Table 37 it can be seen that, in the vocational area, forty-nine students responded, with thirty-three percent (16 students) agreeing with the statement, and sixty-seven percent (33 students) disagreeing. Forty-seven academic students responded, with forty-nine percent (23 students) agreeing, while fifty-one percent (24 students) disagreed with the statement. In the part-time area, forty-eight students responded, and of these, twenty-five percent (12 students) were in agreement, while seventy-five percent (36 students) were in disagreement. Out of the total 144 responses, it can be seen that sixty-five percent (93 students) disagreed with the statement, whereas thirty-five percent agreed.

DISCUSSION AND CRITERIA

Analysis of the results from the questionnaire clearly shows that the students surveyed at Everett Community College want to be involved in college governance. They also advocated equal, or greater, involvement with faculty and administration in two-thirds of the areas surveyed, namely: setting institutional goals, establishing attendance policies, student affairs, allocation of student activity fees, regulation of student conduct, regulation of student organizations, approval of guest speakers invited by students, alterations in college calendar, distribution of student-initiated and off-campus literature on campus, release of student records, curricula or course revision, student probation and suspension policies, planning commencement exercises, and faculty evaluation.

The areas where students did not desire strong representation were all related to situations closely connected to faculty involvement with the institution, such as teaching loads, class size, faculty hiring and promotion, and similar concerns. Only in teacher evaluation did students ask for a strong voice. This choice seems to indicate that if they are heard on the issue, students believe faculty themselves will be able to decide in the students' best interests in other areas.

When the student determined that any area of decision making would have an immediate effect on his well-being, in

issues either directly or indirectly related to his student role on campus, he showed a strong desire to be a part of that decision. An exception to this was areas where the student had already developed a degree of trust. These findings indicate that when the student has had close association with a group, as seen in this study in reference to faculty, an element of trust has been established, and there is no strong desire for control. Where there has been less direct contact, such as occurs with administration, the desire to seek more control is evident.

In no area did students ask for total control in the governance process. These results are similar to those revealed by Shank (1974) at a community college governance conference in Olympia: when discussing the student desire for more participation in college governance, he was quick to point out that students do not seek total determination, but are talking about a shared authority and negotiating with a willingness to compromise.

The results of this study parallel those of a similar survey, conducted at Gaston Community College (Jones, 1974), in so far as the areas in which students demonstrated a desire for involvement. The Everett Community College students surveyed, contrasted with the Gastom Community College students in the degree of participation requested--for example: While sixty-three percent of Everett students desired at least equal involvement in the selection of the college president, only seventeen percent of Gaston students asked

for similar involvement; where sixty-four percent of Everett students favored equal or greater participation in the release of student records, just twenty-nine percent of Gaston students made this request; eighty percent of Everett students asked for equal or greater involvement in the commencement exercises, whereas forty percent of Gaston students favored similar participation; and while seventy-seven percent of Everett students wanted to have equal voice regarding student activities, only fifty percent of students at Gaston asked to be heard at least equally. This general pattern can be seen throughout the results of the study: The students at Everett Community College have demonstrated a strong degree of interest in the governance of their college.

While the results of the first thirty questions reveal that a preponderance of students desire involvement in college governance, the results of the last seven questions indicate that the students have little knowledge about the process of college governance and do not see committee action as a feasible alternative for themselves. If the desire is there, but (according to the data of the study) students are not attracted to present methods of implementation, it is time to change the methods of encouraging student involvement.

Students do participate on a majority of Everett Community College committees, but the survey results indicate that either this participation is not representative of the majority of students or that the students do not have positive feelings relating to their effectiveness. The committee

exists as the current method of decision-making preferred by the majority of faculty and administration, above bureaucratic coercion and political protest. Therefore, there is a need to find ways in which this form of action can be made more attractive to the student.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the author makes the following recommendations regarding student participation in governance at Everett Community College:

1. It is necessary that a campus-wide committee by formed in order to explore avenues for change, giving priority to overall institutional effectiveness. The system should provide means for students to be heard in the areas where they have asked for involvement and where participation can be effective.

2. The process of student government and involvement needs to be streamlined so that it is not so time consuming and more students can participate, particularly given the knowledge that we know many students are working and are busy in other areas. There is a need to find a way for time and effort to be reduced and the whole process rendered as painless as possible.

3. A carefully developed questionnaire is necessary to reduce expenditure of effort. This could be circulated either quarterly or yearly, depending on budget allocation; and ask specific questions about what projects students would like their student government to spend time on. Such a questionnaire could be anonymous or not, with the students having the option of signing a statement such as, "If you would like to serve on a committee to assist in the accomplishment of the goals that you have outlined, would you please write your name, address and telephone number, and somebody from student government will be contacting you," or to leave a blank. In this way the questionnaire also becomes a means of recruitment.

4. The student must be listened to. If this does not occur, then by the second or third time such a questionnaire is circulated, there will not be a response and the result will be increased apathy or militancy. Effectiveness occurs when students' needs in policy formation are given equal weight with administrative convenience and faculty priorities. (Richardson and Bender, 1974)

5. A system should be set up so that, at regular specified intervals, the work of the committee and the participants is evaluated by all concerned, Currently, accountability is increasingly demanded for individuals and organizations; therefore, it is vital that committees also be held accountable for their effectiveness.

6. Efforts should be made, in all sections of the campus, to increase students' awareness regarding their student body and its function. It is suggested that if students do not come to where student body officials are located, then there is a need to go to the students. Attractive notices, with a high degree of visibility, should be placed in all vocational and academic areas. It is important that each student feel his student body represents him and has concern for his needs.

The student of today is not the same as the student of fifty years ago. He has changed and so has society. The student is more mature and the society he has grown up in has led him to expect a voice in matters that affect his welfare. While no particular governance structure is designed to meet his need for growing maturity and self-determination, the student is beneficially affected by an academic climate in which he receives the message that his voice is important.

REFERENCES

Baldridge, J. Victor, ed. Academic Governance. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971.

Base, Donald G., and Sallied Cowgill. A Study of Factors Relating to Student Participation in Community College Governance. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1975.

Burington, Mary. Handbook of Probability and Statistics With Tables. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Carnegie Commission of Higher Education. "Governance of Higher Education." New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Chalick, Condrad et al. A Study to Determine the Participation of Evening and Part-time Students in the College Governance System. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1974.

Clark, Norman C. The Question of Student Government: A Report to the Trustees. Everett, WA: Everett Community College, 1977.

Collins, Charles C. Blueprint for a Cluster College, Topical Paper No. 49. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, April, 1975.

Deegan, William L., Karl O. Drexel, John T. Collins and Dorothy L. Kearney. "Student Participation in Governance." The Junior College Journal, November, 1970.

George, Rickey L. and Karol A. George. "Meeting the Non-Academic Needs Unique to the Junior College Student." NASSP Journal, Vol. 9, No. 2, October 1971.

Herzberg, Frederick. "Work and Motivation." Behavioral Science Concepts and Management Application, Harold Rush, ed. New York: National Industrial Conference Board, 1969.

Jones, Dean H. An Analysis of Students' Perception of Their Role in Governance at Gaston College. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1974.

Keeton, Morris. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1971.

Keniston, Keneth. "The Sources of Student Dissent." Academic Governance, Victor J. Baldridge, ed. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971.

MacGregor, Archie. "How to Strengthen Your Student Government." College Management, April, 1973.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Munroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

O'Banion, T. Institutional Governance and the Community College Student. Paper presented to the Community College Trustee Conference, University of Washington, February, 1969.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. and Louis W. Bender. College Governance. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1974.

_____, Clyde E. Blocker and Louis W. Bender. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

_____ and Louis W. Bender. College Governance. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1974.

APPENDIX A

LETTER FROM THE DEAN OF STUDENTS TO NOVA UNIVERSITY

EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
801 Wetmore Avenue - Everett, Washington 98201 - Phone 259-7151 Area 206

October 11, 1977

TO: NOVA University

FROM: W. J. Deller
Dean of Students

RE: Judith A. Lord
Practicum Proposal

During the spring of 1977 a challenge was issued to the "Student Government" at Everett Community College, by the College president. In essence he suggested that the present method of selecting student body officers did not provide representation of the desires of the student body, and as a result did not respond to the needs of that student body.

Selection of the topic that Ms. Lord has chosen, is primarily the result of the encouragement I gave her to do this project. At present the attitude of the student body officers is a defensive one. Any empirical evidence that can be obtained reflecting the true attitudes and feelings of a widely diverse student body, will provide a basis for devising a representative and responsive student governing body. Ms. Lord's questionnaire will be the first step in that direction. Results of the questionnaire most certainly will be used as a basis for considered action in the area of the student's role in college governance.

WJD:ma

APPENDIX B

LETTER FROM AUTHOR TO STUDENTS

EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
801 Wetmore Avenue - Everett, Washington 98201 - Phone 259-7151 Area 206

November 15, 1977

Dear Student,

I am asking for your help in a project that impacts every student. The attached questionnaire is directed toward finding out what degree of student involvement you would like to see on this campus. I would appreciate it if you would give ten minutes of your time for its completion. If you desire to see the results of the project, I will forward them to you through your present instructor prior to the end of the quarter.

Sincerely,

Judith A. Lord
Instructor - Allied Health

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

I am presently taking less than 12 credit hours at Everett Community College _____

I am presently taking 12 or more credit hours at Everett Community College _____

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE ON STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

QUESTIONNAIRE ON STUDENT INVOLVFMENT: PART I

LEASE CHECK THE RESPONSE THAT BEST FITS YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE DEGREE OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE ON THIS CAMPUS

	No Student Involvement	Some Student Involvement	Equal Student Involvement	Largely Student Controlled	Completely Student Controlled
1. Setting institutional goals					
2. Establishing attendance policies					
3. Student publications					
4. Selection of college president					
5. Selection of college officials directly related to student affairs					
6. Allocation of student activity fees					
7. Faculty hiring					
8. Faculty promotion					
9. Allocation of annual college budget					

10. Regulation of student conduct		
11. Recognition of student organization		
12. Approval of guest speakers invited by students		
13. Teaching loads		
14. Class size		
15. Alterations in college calendar		
16. Distribution of student initiated literature on campus		
17. Distribution of off-campus literature on campus		
18. Teacher salaries		
19. Requirements for degrees and certificates		
20. Release of student records		
21. Admissions standards for curricula and courses		

22. Curricula or course revision, addition or deletion		
23. Allocation of student financial aid		
24. Student probation and suspension policies		
25. Development of campus physical facilities		
26. Determining administrative structure of the college		
27. Planning commencement exercises		
28. College publications		
29. Establishing grading policies		
30. Faculty evaluation		

QUESTIONNAIRE ON STUDENT INVOLVEMENT: PART II

PLEASE CHECK THE RESPONSE THAT BEST FITS
YOUR OWN FEELINGS

	AGREE	DISAGREE
1. I feel that more student participation in college government would make no difference to how the college is run.		
2. I am currently participating in our college government.		
3. I have very little knowledge about college government.		
4. I have very little knowledge about student body activities at our College.		
5. I am fully aware of the funding available for Student Body Activities.		
6. I would like to have a voice in the allocation of student body funds.		
7. I would enjoy being on a committee to investigate whether current student body activities meet student needs.		

APPENDIX D

LETTER FROM DEAN OF STUDENTS TO FACULTY

EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
801 Wetmore Avenue - Everett, Washington 98201 - Phone 259-7151 Area 206

October 25, 1977

TO: Faculty

FROM: W. J. Deller
Dean of Students

RE: Judy Lord's request for survey help.

Nursing faculty member Judy Lord may contact you (as part of a class random sample) to participate in administering a 10-minute survey in the near future. This survey would be administered to a few academic, vocational, and evening classes to determine student perception of their involvement in institutional governance.

She will give you advance warning and will share rough tally results with the class if you so desire. If you can possibly help her - please do so.

WJD:ma

APPENDIX E

LETTER SHOWING PRELIMINARY TALLY OF RESULTS

EVERETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
801 Wetmore Aveunue - Everett, Washington 98201 - Phone 259-7151 Area 206

TO: Instructors and students participating in the recent survey of student attitudes toward their participation in governance at Everett Community College

FROM: Judy Lord

Many thanks for your help in completing this survey. When the results are fully tabulated I feel the information will be most useful to our college. A preliminary summary shows the following totals:

36 % of students would like to have equal involvement

25 % of students would like to have some involvement

18 % of students want no involvement

14 % of students want governance to be largely student controlled

8 % of students want total control over college governance

Should you be interested in the details of the responses to any particular question, I would be pleased to supply the information. I may be reached through the nursing department.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36
MAY 10 1980